



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,874	11/14/2002	Jasmid Tanha	11054-1	8696
25277	7590	07/11/2005	EXAMINER	
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA			BLANCHARD, DAVID J	
1500 MONTREAL ROAD				
BLDG M-58, ROOM EG12				
OTTAWA, ONTARIO, K1A 0R6			ART UNIT	
CANADA			PAPER NUMBER	
1643				
DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NEW CENTRAL FAX NUMBER

Effective July 15, 2005

On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to **571-273-8300**. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number. To give customers time to adjust to the new Central FAX Number, faxes sent to the old number (703-872-9306) will be routed to the new number until September 15, 2005.

After September 15, 2005, the old number will no longer be in service and **571-273-8300** will be the only facsimile number recognized for "centralized delivery".

CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/031,874	TANHA ET AL.
	Examiner David J. Blanchard	Art Unit 1643

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David J. Blanchard.

(3) Margaret McKay.

(2) Larry R. Helms.

(4) Jasmid Tanha.

Date of Interview: 07 July 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 25-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Frenken et al [a] and [b] and Casterman et al, already of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The substance of the interview focused on claim 25 and the art of Frenken et al [a] and [b] and Casterman et al as cited in the Office Action mailed 5/3/2005. Applicant argued that the art of Frenken et al [a] and [b] and Casterman are directed to VHH and not VH and applicant stated that llamas produce both VHH and VH, which are more similar to conventional VH domains of VH-VL pairs (see bridging paragraph of pages 14-15 of the specification). Examiner Helms questioned how the claimed VH llama antibodies are different from VHH llama antibodies and how steps (a)-(e) differ from the prior art to produce a VH llama antibody that is distinguishable from the prior art. The interchangeability of the terms "VH" and "VHH" in the prior art as well as in applicant's disclosure and claims (i.e., "VH or VHH"; claims 26-28) to refer to the same variable heavy domain from camelids remains ambiguous. Applicant indicated that a response addressing the above issues and the previous Office Action mailed 5/3/2005 will be submitted.

Respectively,
David Blanchard
571-272-0827



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

